

1. In reference to SOW Section L.16: We assume that a “WBS level 2” is a narrative response to the requirements in the RTOs at the level of detail of the SOW (i.e., the bulleted requirements). Is this interpretation correct and responsive to NASA’s requirement?

A: Section L.16 Subfactor A-Technical Approach will be revised. Please see Final RFP once released.

2. Based on the DRFP evaluation factors that ask for “a thorough understanding of the requirements” and the detailed explanations asked for in Subfactors A, B, and C, will the government consider redistributing 15 pages from the Past Performance Volume (currently limited to 50 pages) to the Mission Suitability Volume and adding 20 pages to the Mission Suitability Volume page limit to allow 100 pages for this volume?

A: The page limitations stated in the Draft RFP (See Section L.14 Proposal Preparation –General Instructions) will remain unchanged.

3. In reference to Draft RFP Section L.16 Mission Suitability Instructions, Subfactor A –Technical Approach: Does this instruction mean that there is not a requirement for a description of understanding for the remainder of the SOW?

A: See previous answer at question #1.

4. In reference to Draft RFP Section L.16 Mission Suitability Instructions, Subfactor A –Technical Approach: Is there a separate format for addressing SOW 7?

A: See previous answer at question #1.

5. In reference to Draft RFP Section L.16 Mission Suitability Instructions, Subfactor A –Technical Approach -This instruction describes the required response to RTO 1 and RTO 2. The last paragraph of the instruction states that *“The offeror shall identify the most significant potential risks under this contract and also describe the risk management techniques that will be used to manage identified risks during contract performance. Risk factors may be those inherent in the work, unique to the offeror's chosen approach. General areas of possible risk that are of concern to NASA are technical, schedule, cost, security (including personnel, information technology), export control and environmental risks. The identification of risks is the responsibility of the offeror. The offeror's discussion of a risk factor should provide the offeror's approach to managing the risk--the probability of the risk, impact and severity, time frame and risk acceptance or mitigation.”*: Does this instruction mean that there is a requirement for a description of contract risks in addition to those identified for each RTO?

A: See previous answer at question #1.

6. In reference to SOW, Section 7 Information Technology and Exhibit 17 Representative Task Order Number Three -Reference requires the contractor to manage, operate, enhance, and maintain the NSPIRES system or its successor, and to evaluate current information technology-based support requirements for the peer review life cycle as conducted at NASA and propose a solution that optimizes functional performance and cost. Critical considerations for this evaluation and recommendation are

size of the current user community and its growth rate, and the maximum the maximum size of documents to be uploaded by the user community: Can NASA provide this information?

A: The NSPIRES system's current information technology is publicly available at <http://www.nspires.nasaprs.com>.

7. Does NASA have a specific format requirement that could be sent us for information and content suggestions that may influence "Draft" Solicitation Number NNH13465022 for the NRESS?

A: Guidance is contained within the RFP Solicitation Number NNH13465022R Section L.14, L.15, L.16, L.17, L.18 and L.19.

8. In reference to Attachment B, page 75: Please provide clarification of the statement contained in Attachment B, page 75 that reads, "Provide a complete staffing plan that shows how it will fill the staff requirements identified in the organization chart".

A: The Government assumes that the potential offeror refers to Draft RFP, page 75. This section has been revised, please see final RFP once released.

9. In reference to Attachment B, page 75: Would NASA please provide a staffing profile, inclusive of functional role and number of personnel performing each major function that corresponds to the current contract WBS?

A: Each Offeror is expected to provide a staffing plan based on its understanding of the requirements presented in the Final RFP.

10. In reference to Draft RFP Section L: Subfactor A –Technical Approach: Will the government consider excluding the detail WBSs from the page limitation and allow including them as attachments to the technical volume?

A: See previous answer at question #2.

11. Reference L.18 (a) Past Performance Volume, page 87. This requirement is that recent contracts have a minimum average annual cost/fee of \$2.5M within the last 3 years of the RFP release date. Will NASA consider changing the recency to no more than five (5) years ago, and \$2 million total contract value for the prime, \$1M for major subcontractors?

A: In reference to Draft RFP Section L.18(a) Past Performance Volume: the language will be revised to reflect that the requirement will be for recent contracts having a minimum average annual cost/fee of \$1M within the last **5 years** of the RFP release date. Note: This answer has been revised from the previous answer posted on October 31, 2013.

12. Would you please tell us who the incumbent contractor is and what is the current contract number?

A: The incumbent contractor is Smart Global Solutions JV LLC. The contractor number is NNH10CC97C.